


**Landscape influence on small scale water temperature variations in a moorland catchment**

Journal:	<i>Hydrological Processes</i>
Manuscript ID:	HYP-14-0411.R1
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Research Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Dick, Jonathan; University of Aberdeen, School of Geoscience Tetzlaff, Doerthe; University of Aberdeen, Northern Rivers Institute, School of Geosciences Soulsby, Chris; University of Aberdeen, School of Geosciences
Keywords:	Stream temperature, Riparian zones, Thermal regime, Connectivity, Moorland hydrology, Runoff processes


  
 SCHOLARONE™
   
 Manuscripts
   
 Review

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1                   **Landscape influence on small scale water temperature variations in a**  
2                   **moorland catchment**

3                   **J. Dick, D. Tetzlaff and C. Soulsby**

4                   **Northern Rivers Institute, School of Geosciences, University of Aberdeen, Scotland, UK,**  
5                   **AB24 3UF.**

6                   **Abstract**

7                   We monitored temperatures in stream water, groundwater and riparian wetland surface  
8                   water over 18 months in a 3.2 km<sup>2</sup> moorland catchment in the Scottish Highlands. The  
9                   stream occupies a glaciated valley, aligned west-east and has three main headwater  
10                  tributaries with northerly, southerly and westerly aspects. Much of the stream network is  
11                  fringed by riparian peatlands. Stream temperatures are mainly regulated by energy  
12                  exchanges at the air-water interface. However, they are also influenced by inflows from the  
13                  saturated riparian zone, where surface water source areas are strongly connected with the  
14                  stream network. Consequently, the spatial distribution of stream temperatures exhibits  
15                  limited variability. However, there are significant summer differences between the  
16                  headwaters, despite their close proximity to each other. This is consistent with aspect (and  
17                  incident radiation), with the south and west facing headwaters having higher temperatures.  
18                  The largest, north-facing sub-catchment shows lower summer diurnal temperature  
19                  variability, suggesting that lower radiation inputs dampen temperature extremes. Whilst  
20                  stream water temperature regimes in the lower catchment exhibit little change along a 1km  
21                  reach, they are similar to those in the largest headwater; probably reflecting size and  
22                  comparable catchment aspect and hydrological flow paths. Our results suggest that

different parts of the channel network and its connected wetlands have contrasting sensitivity to higher summer temperatures. This may be important in land management strategies designed to mitigate the impacts of projected climatic warming.

26

Keywords: stream temperature, riparian zones, thermal regime, connectivity, moorland hydrology, runoff processes.

29

## 1. Introduction

Stream water temperature is a critical physical parameter in riverine ecosystems (Caissie 2006); it governs many biogeochemical and ecological processes which influence water quality dynamics (Isaak and Hubert 2001) and stream metabolism (Izagirre et al. 2008; Kaushal et al. 2010; Birkel et al. 2013). It has the capacity to influence life cycles of aquatic organisms, such as determining the timing of fish spawning and the ability of organisms to resist disease (Malcolm et al. 2008). Temperature is also known to be a fundamental control on the distribution of organisms, as different species have contrasting tolerance to different temperature ranges (Malcolm et al. 2004; Caissie 2006). Climate change projections imply that even for low emission scenarios, both the winter and summer mean air temperatures in Northern Britain will increase by  $>1^{\circ}\text{C}$  over the next 30 years; worse case scenarios suggest  $4^{\circ}\text{C}$  increase (UKCP09 2009). Given that temperatures are largely controlled by hydroclimatic drivers (e.g. net radiation fluxes), and modulated by the terrestrial environment, these projections suggest that stream temperatures will increase, with concomitant impacts on stream ecology and biogeochemistry likely (Hrachowitz et al. 2010).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Controlling terrestrial environmental factors include shading, provided by riparian vegetation and topography, elevation, groundwater contributions and stream channel morphology (Imholt et al. 2013). Some of these factors can be manipulated to mitigate the effects of climatic warming; this is a current area of policy development. Changes in stream thermal regimes occur as a result of both the aforementioned natural influences, but also of anthropogenic activity, for example, environmental change, reductions in flow, deforestation/afforestation and direct thermal pollution (e.g. effluent discharges). These may occur at all scales, from local, to regional, to global (Isaak et al. 2010; Ficklin et al. 2013).

In the UK, the headwaters of most large river systems drain upland areas of mountain and moorland environments. In such streams, short term (hours to days) temperature dynamics are driven by a combination of incoming solar radiation, stream flows, humidity and evaporation (Sinokrot and Stefan 1994; Caissie 2006; Hannah et al. 2008; Brown et al. 2010). Longer term variations (months, years etc.) are further influenced by reach characteristics (Malcolm et al. 2004), e.g. seasonal changes to riparian shading (Isaak and Hubert 2001; Hannah et al. 2008) and decadal to centurial lasting land management practices. The open moorland settings of many UK headwater streams have resulted from historical tree clearance and land management, which promote grazing of mammals (i.e. sheep (*Ovis aries*) and red deer (*Cervus elaphus*) or shooting of game birds such as red grouse (*Lagopus lagopus scotica*). These channels have limited shading as they often only have dwarf shrubs and grasses bordering them (Brown et al. 2010). Here, surface energy exchanges such as radiation inputs, air temperature, relative humidity and wind speed are the most important factors influencing stream temperatures. These factors determine the heat exchanges at the

1  
2  
3 68 air-water interface (e.g. evaporation, sensible, and latent heat). Heat exchange also occurs  
4  
5 69 at the water-channel bed interface as bed heat flux or loss and gain of net radiative energy.  
6  
7  
8 70 The balance of these components is dynamic, varying both sub-daily and seasonally, with  
9  
10 71 many alternating between both heat sources and sinks (Hannah et al. 2008; Brown et al.  
11  
12 72 2010). Importantly, in such moorland locations, the daily means are often similar (Malcolm  
13  
14  
15 73 et al. 2004), though the temperature extremes are greater (i.e. the maximum and minimum  
16  
17 74 water temperatures) (Hrachowitz et al. 2010) than in higher order watercourses, where  
18  
19  
20 75 riparian tree cover increases (Hannah et al. 2008, Brown et al. 2010). This contrasts with  
21  
22 76 many studies in other regions which have shown that the daily minimum, maximum and  
23  
24 77 mean temperatures in headwater streams tend to be generally lower than larger rivers, as  
25  
26 78 the temperatures more closely reflect groundwater (Poole and Berman 2001; Caissie 2006).  
27  
28  
29 79 Others have also found that water temperatures generally increase downstream reflecting  
30  
31 80 wider stream channels and less shading by vegetation than in forested headwaters (e.g.  
32  
33 81 Lewis et al. 2000; MacDonald et al. 2013a; Moore, Nelitz, and Parkinson 2013).  
34  
35  
36  
37 82 To date, there have been relatively few investigations into the thermal regimes of open  
38  
39 83 moorland streams. Previous work has largely focused on forest streams (e.g. Malcolm et al.  
40  
41 84 2004; Hannah et al. 2008; Brown et al. 2010) or alpine systems (Brown et al. 2006a; Brown  
42  
43 85 and Hannah 2008; Blaen et al. 2012). The small scale spatial and temporal variations of  
44  
45 86 thermal regimes in moorland channels and their associated hydrological source areas (e.g.  
46  
47 87 soil water and groundwater) and landscape controls have rarely been investigated. Given  
48  
49 88 the importance of such headwaters in providing ecosystem services to downstream river  
50  
51 89 systems (Bishop et al. 2008) and the likely impacts of climate change, it is imperative that  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

90 we have a good understanding of the thermal regimes of such streams and their associated  
91 controls.

92 In the Scottish Highlands, climate change projections indicate a likely warming of streams in  
93 summer, which will be exacerbated by reduced low flows (Capell et al., 2013, 2014). Such  
94 streams sustain aquatic ecosystems that have high conservation and economic value, with  
95 internationally important populations of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) (Malcolm et al. 2008)  
96 which may be threatened by warming. Consequently, there are proposals to mitigate the  
97 effects in such streams by riparian planting, though the implications of afforestation on  
98 ecosystem function are poorly understood (Birkel et al. 2013). Moreover, there is little  
99 guidance as to where such planting could be most effective (Wilkerson et al. 2006; Gomi et  
100 al. 2006).

101 Here, we examine small scale variability in stream temperatures and associated source  
102 waters in the 3.2km<sup>2</sup> Bruntland Burn catchment in the Scottish Highlands. This is a tributary  
103 of the 31km<sup>2</sup> Girnock catchment, a mainly moorland catchment that is a long-term  
104 monitoring site for Atlantic salmon and has a history of stream temperature studies  
105 (Hannah et al. 2008; Malcolm et al., 2008a). Previous work has shown a remarkable spatial  
106 consistency of thermal regimes in the moorland part of the river network, with any  
107 differences mainly due to the effect of riparian shading by trees in the lower 2km reach of  
108 the Girnock stream (Malcom et al., 2004). However, the thermal regime of the Bruntland  
109 Burn exhibited more highly moderated temperatures than other sites in the catchment; in  
110 addition to reduced diurnal variations, there are higher winter temperatures and lower  
111 summer temperatures than the other sites (Malcolm et al., 2004). It was also shown that  
112 there are subtle differences between the dominant runoff processes in the Bruntland and

1  
2  
3 113 larger Girnock catchment; with proportionally higher groundwater contributions in the  
4  
5 114 former (Birkel et al. 2011), but also a strong influence of a large riparian wetland that  
6  
7 115 generates around 80% of the annual runoff (Tetzlaff et al., 2014). The current study aimed  
8  
9 116 to characterise and explain the spatial and temporal variability of stream water  
10  
11 117 temperatures within the Bruntland Burn catchment; the specific objectives were to:

- 12 118 1. Characterise any small scale spatial differences in water temperatures in the channel  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 119 network of the Bruntland Burn and the source areas draining into it.  
18  
19  
20  
21 120 2. Investigate the temporal variability and the catchment wide spatial differences at  
22  
23 121 both seasonal and 24 hour scales.  
24  
25 122 3. Examine the dominant controls on spatial and temporal variations in stream water  
26  
27 123 temperatures, particularly with respect to landscape structure and linked water  
28  
29 124 sources.  
30  
31  
32  
33 125

## 34 35 36 126 **2. Study Site**

37  
38  
39 127 The Bruntland Burn is located in the Cairngorms National Park, Scotland, UK (Tetzlaff et al.  
40  
41 128 2007; Tetzlaff et al. 2014). In brief, the area has been glaciated and has over-widened,  
42  
43 129 gently sloping valley floors, receiving drainage from steeper hillslopes. The geology is mainly  
44  
45 130 granite in the most elevated areas, with associated metamorphic rocks fringing. The bedrock  
46  
47 131 is covered by various drift deposits (mainly poorly sorted till), which can be up to 40m deep  
48  
49 132 in the valley bottoms. Land cover in the Bruntland Burn is mostly heather (*Calluna vulgaris*)  
50  
51 133 dominated moorland, with limited forest cover (Figure 1a). The only significant riparian tree  
52  
53  
54  
55 134 shading is located at the catchment outlet, where a plantation fringes the southern side of  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

135 the stream. Thereafter the channel becomes tree-lined up to its confluence with the Girnock  
136 Burn. Upstream of this, dominant vegetation in the riparian zone includes *Sphagnum spp.*  
137 mosses, dwarf shrubs (*Myrica gale*) and grasses (*Molina caerulea*). The channel is relatively  
138 narrow (typically <1m) and deep (up to 2m in places) with overhanging vegetation, so in  
139 summer, when the *Myrica* is in leaf and water levels are lower, the radiation flux to the  
140 water surface is lower than might be expected.

141 A dominant feature of the catchment hydrology is that the riparian areas are mainly  
142 comprised of organic soils (histosols), which are quasi-permanent saturation zones that can  
143 be highly dynamic in their expansion and contraction (Figure 1b). The extent of the  
144 saturated area ranges between 2-40% of the catchment, depending upon the antecedent  
145 hydroclimatic conditions (Birkel et al. 2010). Around 80% of annual streamflow is generated  
146 from overland flow and seepage from these areas, the remainder comes from deeper  
147 groundwater discharge into the stream channel (Tetzlaff et al. 2014). Mean annual  
148 precipitation (P) is approximately 1000 mm and mean annual evapotranspiration (ET) is  
149 relatively low (~ 400 mm). Snow usually comprises < 10% of the annual P. Precipitation is  
150 evenly distributed with limited seasonality and most falls in low intensity frontal events  
151 (50% falls in events of <10 mm). Most events instigate a streamflow response, as water is  
152 displaced via saturation-excess overland flow from the saturated riparian zones, which are  
153 most of the time hydrologically connected to the channel network (Birkel et al. 2010).  
154 Runoff coefficients are typically <10%, but these increase non-linearly in wetter periods to  
155 around >40%, as the saturated zone in the valley bottom expands and connects lateral flow  
156 in the podzolic soils on the steeper hillslope to the channel network (Tetzlaff et al. 2014).



1  
2  
3 157 Mean annual air temperatures are about 6°C, ranging between 12°C and 1°C in summer and  
4  
5 158 winter respectively.  
6  
7

8  
9 159 The Bruntland Burn has three main headwaters with contrasting characteristics (Figure 1c):  
10  
11 160 Headwater One (HW1, 0.65 km<sup>2</sup>) is south-facing and distinguished by a large mire in the  
12  
13 161 valley bottom; the edges of the mire receive groundwater seepage from the surrounding  
14  
15 162 hillslopes. Histosols cover 17% of this sub-catchment. The small stream draining HW1 has a  
16  
17 163 shallow gradient and predominantly pool-riffle morphology. In contrast, Headwater Two  
18  
19 164 (HW2, 0.43 km<sup>2</sup>) is a steep east-facing valley (average slope 15°) drained by a channel  
20  
21 165 dominated by a cascade morphology. Soils on the steep slopes are mainly podsols and  
22  
23 166 rankers, though histosols in the valley bottom cover 8% of the sub-catchment. Headwater  
24  
25 167 Three (HW3, 0.81 km<sup>2</sup>), is the largest and drains a wetland-dominated cirque, where deep  
26  
27 168 peats (histosols) and shallow peats constitute 22% of the sub-catchment. The corrie base is  
28  
29 169 wide; the average slope of the catchment is 14°. Channel morphology is predominantly  
30  
31 170 step-pool, with pool-riffle becoming more common in the lower area close to the  
32  
33 171 confluence with main channel.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 172 The confluence of these three headwaters is located in an over-widened glaciated valley,  
41  
42 173 orientated west-east with a large area of histosols fringing the main Bruntland Burn. In this  
43  
44 174 lower catchment, histosols cover 21.5% of the area. The dominant channel morphology  
45  
46 175 here is pool-riffle. As noted above, the lower stream channel is narrow with a low width-  
47  
48 176 depth ratio. This, together with a lack of riparian trees, means that most shading is due to  
49  
50 177 channel dimensions, aspect (West-East) and riparian shrub cover (Table 1). Throughout the  
51  
52 178 stream network there are point source influxes of surface water draining adjacent mires  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

(Figure 1). These are active most of the year, and stop flowing only in the driest conditions (Birkel et al. 2010).

**3. Data and methods**

The monitoring period ran between 21<sup>st</sup> June 2012 and 21<sup>st</sup> September 2013, though in order to not produce a summer bias, all annual analysis was based on the period 1<sup>st</sup> July 2012 to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2013. The monitoring period was chosen to allow seasonal comparison. Seasons were defined astronomically (i.e. between solstice and equinox) based on the orbit of the Earth.

Hydroclimatic data (precipitation, air temperatures, radiation, humidity and wind speed) were measured at an automatic weather station (AWS) in the Girnock catchment, operated by Marine Scotland Science (c.f. Hannah et al. 2004). Both discharge, calculated using an established rating equation (with stage height derived from a capacitance water level recorder in a rated natural section) and precipitation (using a Davis tipping bucket rain gauge) were measured within the Bruntland Burn catchment, using Odyssey data recording loggers at 15 minute intervals and averaged to hourly records.

Water temperature was measured using TinyTag TGP-4017 loggers (Gemini data loggers) with internal thermistors of 0.5°C precision. They have a response time of 25 minutes (“Temperature Loggers and Outdoor Data Loggers for Environmental Monitoring” 2013). Due to logistical and physical constraints, a 1 hour recording interval was used to reduce the download frequency, account for the response time and to control the quantity of data produced. Data was also used from two CTD Divers (Schlumberger Water Services), precise

1  
2  
3 201 to 0.1°C. These were originally installed in the catchment in 2011, as part of a separate  
4  
5 202 hydrology study. These also recorded every 15 minutes (and were averaged to one hour). All  
6  
7  
8 203 loggers were calibrated across a range larger than field temperatures, before and after the  
9  
10 204 study period and were shown to be within 0.5°C accuracy.

11  
12  
13 205 The monitoring network represented a compromise between extensive spatial coverage,  
14  
15 206 and being logistically manageable. Eleven stream loggers were installed to measure  
16  
17  
18 207 temperature; one in each of the headwater tributaries (HW1-HW3) and then at regular  
19  
20 208 distances along the main stem of the Burn (SW4-11) (Figure 1). Logistics and access  
21  
22 209 problems precluded installation at upstream sites in the tributaries, but data collected at  
23  
24 210 their lower points captured their thermal characteristics. Previous work showed that the  
25  
26 211 main deep groundwater influxes to the stream channel occurred along the wide, flat valley  
27  
28 212 bottom, downstream of the headwater confluence. The intense monitoring along the main  
29  
30 213 stem was therefore designed to detect effects of any major groundwater discharges as  
31  
32 214 winter “hot spots” or summer “cold spots”. To measure deeper (>2m) groundwater  
33  
34 215 temperatures, one logger was located in an emerging spring (GW1) at the foot of the  
35  
36 216 northern slopes in the lower catchment. Three further loggers were situated in wells along a  
37  
38 217 hillslope transect (GW2-4) measuring shallower (<2m) groundwater levels. This hillslope  
39  
40 218 transect has been the focus of detailed process studies on water flows paths and residence  
41  
42 219 times, particularly in the hydrologically dominant riparian saturation zone (Tetzlaff et al.  
43  
44 220 2014; Geris et al. 2014). To measure surface water temperatures in this critical riparian  
45  
46 221 zone, four loggers were positioned within connected perennial water tracks on the hillslope  
47  
48 222 (SFW1) and riparian zone (SFW2-4) (Figure 1). The stream water loggers were attached to  
49  
50 223 rocks and tethered to the bank, due to the lack of other available substrates and mainly  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

peat bed and banks. The thermistors were shielded from radiation (Long and Jackson, 2013) and positioned on the streambed. Stream loggers were placed in sections of deeper water to reduce the chance of dewatering (Table 1). Given the small channel dimensions, relative water velocities, lack of a hyporheic influence and earlier work by Imholt et al., (2013) the effects of locational biasing was deemed unlikely to have a major effect.

Prior to statistical analysis, the data was manually checked and all spurious outliers (e.g. dewatering during data download) were removed (Sowder and Steel 2012) to produce a set of data free of errors. To investigate spatial differences in water temperatures mean, maximum, minimum and standard deviation were calculated for each of the stream water (HW1-3 and SW4-11) and groundwater (GW1-4) loggers for the whole study period and then for each of the seasons (including summer 2012). Degree days were calculated for each of the stream water locations as another way of visualising the differences, as they represent the sum of temperatures above the base level of 0°C. In addition, we also carried out Kruskal-Wallis tests (Hollander, Wolfe, and Chicken 2013) and Wilcoxon signed-rank tests (Hollander, Wolfe, and Chicken 2013). These were selected as they are non-parametric tests, to compare the medians of non-normally distributed data sets. Because of the nature of stream water and its down-stream interdependence, we used the maximum instantaneous temperature recorded per day as well as the median. The reason for this was that previous work on spatially distributed temperature sensors in the Girnock had shown that differences were most apparent in the upper ranges, whilst lower temperatures were constrained by freezing, and medians were similar between sites.

The Kruskal-Wallis test was run using the full data set from July 2012 – July 2013 for all sites, as well as just the daily maximum temperatures. In addition, we ran the Wilcoxon test

on paired loggers moving downstream as a post-hoc test for the variability between them, using a Bonferroni correction (Holm 1979) to adjust the p values. These tests assume that the data are independent, which is not strictly true in stream temperature studies, thus the results must be interpreted cautiously. The analysis then focussed on selected loggers (loggers HW1, HW2, HW3, SW5, SW9 and SW11) that summarized the thermal regime of the stream network and produced reasonable spatial distribution (see Figure 1), which then allowed more analysis at sub-seasonal scales.

To further assess differences between locations, seasonal temperature-duration curves (Brown et al. 2006b) were derived showing the percentage of time a particular temperature was equalled or exceeded. Based on the hydrometric data, we also calculated time-series of the extent of catchment saturation, using the algorithm (based on precipitation, antecedent wetness and a soil moisture parameter over the previous seven days) developed by Birkel et al., (2010). This was coupled with the available precipitation data and discharge data as a measure of antecedent wetness, and as a proxy for the source areas of water within the stream, on which incoming radiation can act. This characterisation of the catchment's wetness allowed the selection of contrasting 24 hour periods throughout the year. These were categorised as warm/wet, warm/dry, cold/wet and cold/dry. Temperatures for HW1-3, SW11, SFW3 & 4, GW1 and air temperature were investigated for each of the periods: cold/dry on 9<sup>th</sup> November 2012 (mean air T 6.8°C, mean daily Q 0.03 m<sup>3</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>, daily P 0mm and saturation extent 7%); cold/wet on 1<sup>st</sup> February 2013 (mean air T 1.6°C, mean daily Q 0.17 m<sup>3</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>, daily P 1mm and saturation extent 33%); warm/dry on 8<sup>th</sup> September 2012 (mean air T 15.6°C, mean daily Q 0.024 m<sup>3</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>, daily P 0mm and saturation extent 2%); warm/wet on

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

269 27<sup>th</sup> August 2012 (mean air T 12.6°C, mean daily Q 0.04 m<sup>3</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>, daily P 12.6mm and  
270 saturation extent 7%).

271  
272 **4. Results**

273 **4.1 Hydroclimatological context**

274 Air temperatures followed expected seasonal patterns, reflecting incoming radiation (Figure  
275 2a and b). However, a cool, wet summer in 2012 was followed by an unusually cold winter  
276 and spring in 2013 (Figure 2b), with below-average temperatures persisting until April (Met  
277 Office 2013a; 2013b). This also corresponded with long periods of snow cover and ground  
278 frost which coincided with intermittent partial freezing of the upper soils (<5cm) and the  
279 stream surface. Warmer spells in mid-December 2012 and late February 2013 led to snow  
280 melt and substantial increases in discharge of up to 16 mm per day, which was the highest  
281 discharge observed (Figure 2d). Whilst the summer of 2012 was the wettest for 100 years,  
282 summer 2013 was the driest and warmest for 10 years (Met Office 2012; Met Office 2013c).  
283 The extent of the saturated riparian zone (as a percentage of catchment area) was  
284 calculated using an algorithm that expressed antecedent conditions as a function of  
285 evapotranspiration (ET) and precipitation (Birkel et al. 2010). During the wetter periods (e.g.  
286 winter 2012-2013) the saturation extent was >40% (Figure 2e). In summer with higher  
287 temperatures, saturation extent remained <20% and was <5% for sub-monthly periods.

288  
289 **4.2 Spatial variations in water temperature**

290 Spatially, the average, range and dynamics of stream water temperatures are very similar  
291 throughout the catchment (Table 2 and Figure 3). Differences between the three  
292 headwaters become apparent only during the summer periods, when temperatures are  
293 highest. HW1 had the largest variations in temperature and a slightly higher mean. HW2 had  
294 the highest maximum temperature but a slightly smaller standard deviation than HW1. In  
295 contrast, HW3 showed the most damped dynamics (low standard deviations) and lowest  
296 mean temperature. Degree day analysis correspondingly showed similar patterns between  
297 the headwaters; HW3 had the lowest and HW1 the highest. The minimum temperatures for  
298 all sites were similar and within the precision of the instrumentation, they remained in  
299 liquid water throughout the period.

300 Mean stream water temperatures, downstream of the headwater confluence, (locations  
301 SW4-11) remained relatively constant, though they were closest in range to HW3 and did  
302 not exhibit the extreme high temperatures of HW2 and HW3. Only SW10 deviated  
303 substantially with a lower mean and maximum temperature. This site is downstream of the  
304 inflow of the groundwater spring monitored at GW1. The annual degree days for the post  
305 confluence sites also showed relative homogeneity, though they were lowest of all sites at  
306 SW10 (Table 2).

307 Of the groundwater sites, GW1 exhibited remarkable thermal constancy and had the highest  
308 median. Shallower subsurface water at the upslope sites (GW2 and 3) had greater variability  
309 (Figures 3 and 4, Table 2). These dynamics differed from stream waters, in terms of a  
310 reduced range, though the medians of GW2 and 3 were close to the stream sites. GW4  
311 (situated in the riparian peats where the water table remains within 20cm of the soil  
312 surface) had lower variation, showed higher mean and minimum, but lower maximum

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

313 temperature than sites further up the hillslope (where the water table depth varies between  
314 20cm to >1m below the surface).

315 The riparian surface water loggers (SFW3 & SFW4) had similar median temperatures to  
316 stream water. The variation of these surface waters was higher than the stream water  
317 temperatures along the main stem. SFW3 showed similar temperatures to the main  
318 channel, and SFW4, situated in the riparian zone further upstream from SFW3, showed the  
319 greatest temperature variability of all surface water loggers, largely as a result of occasional  
320 winter freezing (Figure 3 and Figure 4).

321 Results of the statistical tests showed that there were no statistically significant differences  
322 between the medians of stream water sites ( $p>0.05$ ). However, for the maximum daily  
323 temperatures showed a significant difference ( $p<0.05$ ) with HW3 being different to HWs1  
324 and 2. The tests also confirmed the difference of the four GW sites from the stream water  
325 sites ( $p<0.5$ ), whilst there was no pairwise difference between the stream water site at  
326 SW11 and the four SFW loggers.

327

328 4.3 Seasonal variability in water temperatures

329 The seasonality of weekly stream temperatures showed similar temporal variations at the  
330 headwater sites and the sites along the main stem (Figure 5, Table 3). The main stem (SW4-  
331 11) showed no significant inter-site seasonal variation (Table 3) and exhibited similar  
332 variability during all seasons. HW3, which had the lowest variability in all seasons, was most  
333 similar to the main stem sites. The most apparent differences were the higher summer  
334 temperatures in HW1 and HW2.



Temperature exceedance curves show the integrated effect of these seasonal changes; differences are most clear during summer (Figure 6). HW3's lower summer temperatures and variability is apparent, as is the intermediate distribution of main stem summer stream temperatures plotting between HW1&2 and HW3. During autumn 2012, the upper portion of the curves for all sites was similar, with the tail of the distribution showing separation, and HW3 being warmer than HW2 and HW1 as temperatures dropped (Figure 6a). During winter and spring (Figure 6b and c), the duration curves converged with little difference, though in spring the warmer temperatures in HW1 began to become apparent. The warm, dry summer of 2013 (Figure 6d) had higher temperature extremes than the cooler, wetter summer of 2012 (Figure 6e), with inter-site differences becoming more evident as temperatures increased, particularly in 2013. In this latter year (Figure 6d), HW2 had the steepest and HW3 the shallowest curve. During such warm conditions, temperatures in the riparian surface water sites (SFW) tend to be higher than HW3, but cooler than HW1 & 2.

#### 4.4. Diurnal variability in water temperature

Temperatures during four 24 hour periods (Figures 7-10) give examples of the typical diurnal variations of the stream waters and representative source waters. These show fairly consistent differences in the diurnal cycles of the 3 headwaters, in relation to the main stem sites. The 24 hour periods exemplify contrasting antecedent and hydroclimatic conditions: cold and wet (1<sup>st</sup> February 2013), cold and dry (9<sup>th</sup> November 2012), warm and wet (28<sup>th</sup> August 2012) and warm and dry (8<sup>th</sup> September 2012). Stream temperatures in the lower catchment (SW sites) usually fall between HW1&2 and HW3, but are also similar to the SFW

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

sites. The deep groundwater (GW 1) remains constant throughout each 24 hour period considered.

The cold/wet period (Figure 7a) exhibited the least spatial variability between sites. Water at all sites was super-cooled and close to 0°C. Over the 24 hours, air temperature dropped steadily (Figure 7b). Of the headwater sites, HW3 exhibited the highest maximum temperature and HW1, the lowest. In the main stem, SW11 showed the highest peak (~1.5 °C) of all, with the peak around 3pm approximately 2 hours after the headwaters. SFW3 remained more constant, at around 1.5°C, and showed similar levels and patterns as the streams and remained above air temperature during the afternoon. SFW4 showed greatest variability.

The cold, dry 24 hour period occurred at the end of a dry autumn. Air temperature (Figure 8) showed modest variability, but a decrease in the evening of ~4 °C. Stream temperatures varied between 4.5 and 6.5°C (Figure 8a). HW3 showed the least variability and HW2 the greatest. SW11's diel curve was most similar to the shape and magnitude of HW3. Both HW1 and HW3 reached thermal maxima around 14:00, several hours after HW2. This was also about 2 hours before the peak of SW11, at the catchment outlet, and several hours after the peak at surface water site SFW3. This site showed the least variability in surface water temperatures, with temperatures being slightly cooler than stream water, though the variability in SFW4 was similar to the stream.

The wet, warm period in August 2012 had stream water temperatures ranging from around 10°C to 12°C (Figure 9a); air temperatures varied between 9°C and 14°C. HW3 had the lowest variation (~1°C). The highest maximum (>12°C) was at HW2. HW1 was intermediate but had the lowest minimum value. Thermal maxima at all sites occurred at 16:00. Both

HW3 and SW11 had very similar magnitude diel variations, with HW3 generally having a slightly lower maximum and higher minimum values. Surface water temperatures exhibited slightly higher values and variability was higher at SFW4, but lower at SFW3. Day-time peaks occurred slightly before stream water temperature at SW11 peaked.

Warm, dry conditions in September 2012 saw air temperature ranges from 7°C to >20°C (Figure 10). Again, HW3 showed least variability (range <2.0°C) and HW1 the greatest (range ~5°C). The daily maxima for the three headwaters occurred simultaneously (15:00) with SW11 being about 2 hours later. As with other periods, SFW3 showed lower variability with a lower magnitude curve, more similar to stream waters than SFW4, which was more pronounced like the diurnal air temperature curve.

## 5. Discussion and wider implications

Many studies have examined interactions between landscape structures and stream temperatures (Malcolm et al. 2004; Hannah et al. 2008; Malcolm et al. 2008; Brown et al. 2010), though some have been based in very different geographical settings to the one in this study (Brown et al. 2006a; Brown and Hannah 2008; Isaak et al. 2010; Mayer 2012; Blaen et al. 2012; Leach and Moore 2013). However, all have highlighted heterogeneities that can occur in stream thermal regimes, with differences in controls at contrasting temporal and spatial scales (Webb and Walling 1985).

The first obvious finding of the study was the general similarities in stream water temperatures, throughout the catchment, for most of the period. Only during the summer months did differences between any stream water sites become apparent and statistically significant. This was largely restricted to the south-facing HW1 and east facing HW2 sub-

1  
2  
3 402 catchments and showed higher maximum temperatures. Correspondingly, it seems that  
4  
5 403 HW3 has a disproportionate influence on the thermal regime of the lower catchment  
6  
7 404 downstream of the confluence of the three tributaries, as its annual range seasonal  
8  
9 405 variations and diurnal dynamics were most similar to the main stem sites. On the one hand,  
10  
11 406 this probably simply reflects the larger size and, therefore, likely higher discharge and higher  
12  
13 407 thermal capacity (Constantz et al. 1994). Additionally, the characteristics of HW3 and the  
14  
15 408 lower catchment have many similarities, including large north-facing areas, similar  
16  
17 409 distributions of soils and drift and similar landscape structure in terms of riparian saturated  
18  
19 410 zones. This is likely to result in a similar relative importance of runoff generation processes  
20  
21 411 (Tetzlaff et al. 2007). Such influence of different runoff sources on stream thermal regimes  
22  
23 412 has been previously shown (R. D. (Dan) Moore 2006; Mayer 2012; MacDonald et al. 2013b;  
24  
25 413 Imholt et al. 2013). Runoff generation in the Bruntland Burn is dominated by near surface  
26  
27 414 flow paths – particularly overland flow from peaty soils – which maintain strong hydrological  
28  
29 415 connectivity with the channel network. These extensive areas of saturation act, not only as  
30  
31 416 hydrological source areas, but as a water-air interface for energy exchange additional to the  
32  
33 417 actual channel network (Janisch et al. 2012). This is consistent with the finding that the  
34  
35 418 surface water sites have similar thermal regimes to stream water sites.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44 419 Groundwater inflows have been shown to have a moderating effect on steam water  
45  
46 420 temperatures in many locations (e.g. Webb and Walling 1985; MacDonald et al. 2013). The  
47  
48 421 groundwater temperatures at GW1 are clearly very stable throughout the year, due to the  
49  
50 422 insulation effects of surface sediments (soil, glacial drift etc; (Figura et al. 2011). However, in  
51  
52 423 the Bruntland Burn up to 40% of annual runoff is generated by hillslope groundwater  
53  
54 424 discharging into the riparian wetlands (Tetzlaff et al. 2014), thus facilitating an opportunity  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 425 for atmospheric energy exchanges to occur, before water reaches the stream channel.  
4  
5 426 Indeed, the groundwater wells in the riparian zone showed that temperatures in shallower  
6  
7 427 groundwater had more variable thermal regimes, reflecting the greater influence of  
8  
9 428 atmospheric energy exchanges (Kurylyk et al. 2013). The contribution of deeper  
10  
11 429 groundwater discharge directly into the stream channel network is low (around 19% of  
12  
13 430 annual runoff) (Birkel et al. 2011). Its influence is most apparent during winter when heat  
14  
15 431 transfer into streams can account for up to 30% of inputs – as atmospheric energy inputs  
16  
17 432 are low – and probably prevent the stream from freezing (Hannah et al., 2004).  
18  
19 433 Nevertheless, the effects of the spring, monitored at GW1, on stream temperatures is  
20  
21 434 evident at SW10, which has the lowest degree days of all stream water sites.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 435 Aside from SW10, the thermal regimes of the monitoring sites in the lower part of the  
28  
29 436 catchment, along the main stem of the stream channel, are consistent and lacking in  
30  
31 437 variability. In addition to the similar catchment characteristics and runoff sources as HW3, in  
32  
33 438 summer, this may also, to some extent, reflect the low width:depth ratio of the channel  
34  
35 439 (Sinokrot and Stefan 1993; Hawkins et al. 1997; Arscott et al. 2001; Long and Jackson 2013)  
36  
37 440 and the riparian cover of shrubs. This would mitigate further warming by limiting incident  
38  
39 441 short wave radiation and moderate night time cooling by back scatter of long wave (Hannah  
40  
41 442 et al. 2008; Malcolm et al. 2008).  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47 443 The thermal regimes monitored in stream water in the Bruntland Burn largely reflect the  
48  
49 444 dominance of hydroclimatic controls at inter-annual, seasonal and diurnal scales, which give  
50  
51 445 overall similarity between sites. The most obvious difference is that the spatial variability in  
52  
53 446 stream water primarily reflects aspect (and the resulting influence on energy inputs), with  
54  
55 447 the three headwater streams having the most marked differences in thermal regimes in  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

summer. The importance of aspect as a landscape factor in the moderation of atmospheric exposure is well documented (e.g Cadbury et al., 2008; Quinton and Carey, 2008; Janisch et al., 2012) among others. The south-facing HW1 is generally the most variable, whilst the east facing HW2 exhibits the highest summer maxima, particularly in 2013. This may also affect hydrological influences, as flows (although unmeasured) were observed to be very low from this sub-catchment, during the 2013 drought period, and this will have affected the thermal capacity of this stream (Sinokrot and Gulliver 2000; Caissie 2006; Orr et al. 2014). HW3 has the most moderated thermal regime, with attenuated maxima and minima and the lowest range through autumn, spring, and summer.

Projections indicate that there is likely to be large scale warming of streams, due to the effects of climate change, on un-forested headwater streams in the northern UK, by the middle of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (Hrachowitz et al. 2010). Our results suggest that an understanding, of small scale, subtle spatial differences in summer stream water temperature, is likely to be important in impact assessment for small moorland catchments, like the Bruntland Burn. Such understanding enables the evaluation of the implications of changing meteorological conditions on small headwater catchments, in which the thermal heterogeneity can be substantial (e.g. in sub-catchment comparisons) at higher temperatures. Here lethal or sub-lethal effects may occur on organisms adapted to colder water upland streams. As upland streams are often important nursery streams for Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*), concerns over projected temperature increases have resulted in the promotion of riparian tree planting as an ameliorative measure (Rutherford et al. 1997; Broadmeadow et al. 2011). Given the likely importance of the water-air interface on

1  
2  
3 470 saturated peaty soils, more extensive buffer strips that result in natural tree cover in such a  
4  
5 471 saturated area may need to be considered, to achieve temperature amelioration goals.  
6  
7  
8 472 These preliminary results provide a basis for using more quantitative methods focusing on  
9  
10 473 analyses of temporal and spatial distributions of land/water-energy exchanges, for example,  
11  
12 474 using LIDAR in conjunction with daily assessment of solar position to account for effects of  
13  
14 475 aspect, hillslope and channel shading. Additionally, groundwater models are being used to  
15  
16 476 simultaneously track water and heat fluxes, to assess the overall effect of direct and indirect  
17  
18 477 groundwater fluxes (Kurylyk, Bourque, and MacQuarrie 2013b). Finally, whilst increasing  
19  
20 478 riparian shading to improve the thermal habitat for juvenile salmonids is a current target of  
21  
22 479 some land management strategies, there are wider ecosystem effects on other components  
23  
24 480 of aquatic function that need to be assessed.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

## 34 482 **6. Conclusions**

35  
36  
37 483 This study investigated the spatial and temporal variations in stream water temperatures in  
38  
39 484 a small headwater catchment. We conclude that:

- 40  
41  
42 485 • Stream waters within the catchment have very similar thermal regimes; the main  
43  
44 486 differences are restricted to differing summer high temperatures in three headwater  
45  
46 487 sub-catchments with contrasting aspect.  
47  
48  
49 488 • The largest headwater catchment (HW3) appears to have a dominant influence on  
50  
51 489 the lower catchment which reflects both the size of HW3 but also the similarities in  
52  
53 490 water sources, mitigation effects of the saturated riparian zones.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- The temperature profile of the stream in the lower catchment appears to be strongly influenced by the energy balance of the source areas (e.g. riparian saturation zones with overland flow) and not just the stream channel.

**Acknowledgements:**

Iain Malcolm and staff at Marine Scotland (Pitlochry) are thanked for the provision of data from the AWS.

**7. References**

Arscott, David B, Klement Tockner, and J V Ward. 2001. "Thermal Heterogeneity along a Braided Floodplain River (Tagliamento River, Northeastern Italy)." *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 58 (12): 2359–73. doi:10.1139/f01-183.

Birkel, C., D. Tetzlaff, S. M Dunn, and C. Soulsby. 2009. "Towards a Simple Dynamic Process Conceptualization in Rainfall–runoff Models Using Multi-criteria Calibration and Tracers in Temperate, Upland Catchments." *Hydrological Processes* 24 (3): 260–75. doi:10.1002/hyp.7478.

Birkel, C., D. Tetzlaff, S. M. Dunn, and C. Soulsby. 2010. "Towards a Simple Dynamic Process Conceptualization in Rainfall–runoff Models Using Multi-Criteria Calibration and Tracers in Temperate, Upland Catchments." *Hydrological Processes* 24 (3): 260–75. doi:10.1002/hyp.7478.

Birkel, Christian, Chris Soulsby, Iain Malcolm, and Doerthe Tetzlaff. 2013. "Modeling the Dynamics of Metabolism in Montane Streams Using Continuous Dissolved Oxygen Measurements." *Water Resources Research* 49 (9): 5260–75. doi:10.1002/wrcr.20409.

Birkel, Christian, Doerthe Tetzlaff, Sarah M. Dunn, and Chris Soulsby. 2011. "Using Time Domain and Geographic Source Tracers to Conceptualize Streamflow Generation Processes in Lumped Rainfall-Runoff Models." *Water Resources Research* 47 (February): 15 PP. doi:201110.1029/2010WR009547.

Bishop, K., I. Buffam, M. Erlandsson, J. Fölster, Hjalmar Laudon, Jan Seibert, and J. Temnerud. 2008. "Aqua Incognita: The Unknown Headwaters." *Hydrological Processes* 22 (8): 1239–42.

Blaen, Phillip J., David M. Hannah, Lee E. Brown, and Alexander M. Milner. 2012. "Water Temperature Dynamics in High Arctic River Basins." *Hydrological Processes*, n/a–n/a. doi:10.1002/hyp.9431.



- 523 Broadmeadow, S. B., J. G. Jones, T. E. L. Langford, P. J. Shaw, and T. R. Nisbet. 2011. "The  
524 Influence of Riparian Shade on Lowland Stream Water Temperatures in Southern  
525 England and Their Viability for Brown Trout." *River Research and Applications* 27 (2):  
526 226–37. doi:10.1002/rra.1354.
- 527 Brown, L. E., L. Cooper, J. Holden, and S. J. Ramchunder. 2010. "A Comparison of Stream  
528 Water Temperature Regimes from Open and Afforested Moorland, Yorkshire Dales,  
529 Northern England." *Hydrological Processes* 24 (22): 3206–18.
- 530 Brown, Lee E., and David M. Hannah. 2008. "Spatial Heterogeneity of Water Temperature  
531 across an Alpine River Basin." *Hydrological Processes* 22 (7): 954–67.  
532 doi:10.1002/hyp.6982.
- 533 Brown, Lee E., David M. Hannah, and Alexander M. Milner. 2006a. "Thermal Variability and  
534 Stream Flow Permanency in an Alpine River System." *River Research and  
535 Applications* 22 (4): 493–501. doi:10.1002/rra.915.
- 536 ———. 2006b. "Hydroclimatological Influences on Water Column and Streambed Thermal  
537 Dynamics in an Alpine River System." *Journal of Hydrology* 325 (1–4): 1–20.  
538 doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2005.09.025.
- 539 Cadbury, S. L., D. M. Hannah, A. M. Milner, C. P. Pearson, and L. E. Brown. 2008. "Stream  
540 Temperature Dynamics within a New Zealand Glacierized River Basin." *River  
541 Research and Applications* 24 (1): 68–89. doi:10.1002/rra.1048.
- 542 Caissie, D. 2006. "The Thermal Regime of Rivers: A Review." *Freshwater Biology* 51 (8):  
543 1389–1406. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2427.2006.01597.x.
- 544 Capell, R., D. Tetzlaff, R. Essery, and C. Soulsby. 2014. "Projecting Climate Change Impacts on  
545 Stream Flow Regimes with Tracer-Aided Runoff Models-Preliminary Assessment of  
546 Heterogeneity at the Mesoscale." *Hydrological Processes* 28 (3): 545–58.
- 547 Capell, R., D. Tetzlaff, and C. Soulsby. 2013. "Will Catchment Characteristics Moderate the  
548 Projected Effects of Climate Change on Flow Regimes in the Scottish Highlands?"  
549 *Hydrological Processes* 27 (5): 687–99. doi:10.1002/hyp.9626.
- 550 Constantz, Jim, Carole L. Thomas, and Gary Zellweger. 1994. "Influence of Diurnal Variations  
551 in Stream Temperature on Streamflow Loss and Groundwater Recharge." *Water  
552 Resources Research* 30 (12): 3253–64.
- 553 Ficklin, Darren L., Iris T. Stewart, and Edwin P. Maurer. 2013. "Effects of Climate Change on  
554 Stream Temperature, Dissolved Oxygen, and Sediment Concentration in the Sierra  
555 Nevada in California." *Water Resources Research* 49 (5): 2765–82.  
556 doi:10.1002/wrcr.20248.
- 557 Figura, Simon, David M. Livingstone, Eduard Hoehn, and Rolf Kipfer. 2011. "Regime Shift in  
558 Groundwater Temperature Triggered by the Arctic Oscillation." *Geophysical  
559 Research Letters* 38 (23): n/a–n/a. doi:10.1029/2011GL049749.

1  
2  
3 560 Geris, Josie, Doerthe Tetzlaff, Jeffrey McDonnell, and Chris Soulsby. 2014. "The Relative Role  
4 561 of Soil Type and Tree Cover on Water Storage and Transmission in Northern  
5 562 Headwater Catchments." *Hydrological Processes*.  
6 563 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/hyp.10289/full>.  
7  
8  
9 564 Gomi, Takashi, R. Dan Moore, and Amod S. Dhakal. 2006. "Headwater Stream Temperature  
10 565 Response to Clear-Cut Harvesting with Different Riparian Treatments, Coastal British  
11 566 Columbia, Canada." *Water Resources Research* 42 (8): W08437.  
12 567 doi:10.1029/2005WR004162.  
13  
14 568 Hannah, D.M., I.A. Malcolm, C. Soulsby, and A.F. Youngson. 2004. "Heat Exchanges and  
15 569 Temperatures within a Salmon Spawning Stream in the Cairngorms, Scotland:  
16 570 Seasonal and Sub-Seasonal Dynamics." *River Research and Applications* 20 (6): 635–  
17 571 52.  
18  
19  
20 572 Hannah, David M., Iain A. Malcolm, Chris Soulsby, and Alan F. Youngson. 2008. "A  
21 573 Comparison of Forest and Moorland Stream Microclimate, Heat Exchanges and  
22 574 Thermal Dynamics." *Hydrological Processes* 22 (7): 919–40. doi:10.1002/hyp.7003.  
23  
24 575 Hawkins, Charles P., James N. Hogue, Lynn M. Decker, and Jack W. Feminella. 1997.  
25 576 "Channel Morphology, Water Temperature, and Assemblage Structure of Stream  
26 577 Insects." *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* 16 (4): 728–49.  
27 578 doi:10.2307/1468167.  
28  
29  
30 579 Hollander, Myles, Douglas A. Wolfe, and Eric Chicken. 2013. *Nonparametric Statistical*  
31 580 *Methods*. Vol. 751. John Wiley & Sons.  
32 581 [http://books.google.co.uk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=gYIKAgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&q=Nonparametric+Statistical+Methods&ots=JZolS4at81&sig=Xbyde1RNF99\\_hyeD\\_\\_l](http://books.google.co.uk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=gYIKAgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&q=Nonparametric+Statistical+Methods&ots=JZolS4at81&sig=Xbyde1RNF99_hyeD__lBNOGG89c)  
33 582 [BNOGG89c](http://books.google.co.uk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=gYIKAgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&q=Nonparametric+Statistical+Methods&ots=JZolS4at81&sig=Xbyde1RNF99_hyeD__lBNOGG89c).  
34 583  
35  
36  
37 584 Holm, Sture. 1979. "A Simple Sequentially Rejective Multiple Test Procedure." *Scandinavian*  
38 585 *Journal of Statistics*, 65–70.  
39  
40 586 Hrachowitz, Markus, C. Soulsby, C. Imholt, I. A. Malcolm, and D. Tetzlaff. 2010. "Thermal  
41 587 Regimes in a Large Upland Salmon River: A Simple Model to Identify the Influence of  
42 588 Landscape Controls and Climate Change on Maximum Temperatures." *Hydrological*  
43 589 *Processes* 24 (23): 3374–91. doi:10.1002/hyp.7756.  
44  
45  
46 590 Imholt, C., C. Soulsby, I. A. Malcolm, M. Hrachowitz, C. N. Gibbins, S. Langan, and D. Tetzlaff.  
47 591 2013. "Influence of Scale on Thermal Characteristics in a Large Montane River Basin."  
48 592 *River Research and Applications* 29 (4): 403–19. doi:10.1002/rra.1608.  
49  
50 593 Isaak, Daniel J., and Wayne A. Hubert. 2001. "A Hypothesis About Factors That Affect  
51 594 Maximum Summer Stream Temperatures Across Montane Landscapes1." *JAWRA*  
52 595 *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 37 (2): 351–66.  
53 596 doi:10.1111/j.1752-1688.2001.tb00974.x.  
54  
55  
56 597 Isaak, Daniel J., Charles H. Luce, Bruce E. Rieman, David E. Nagel, Erin E. Peterson, Dona L.  
57 598 Horan, Sharon Parkes, and Gwynne L. Chandler. 2010. "Effects of Climate Change  
58  
59  
60

- 599 and Wildfire on Stream Temperatures and Salmonid Thermal Habitat in a Mountain  
600 River Network." *Ecological Applications* 20 (5): 1350–71. doi:10.1890/09-0822.1.
- 601 Izagirre, Oihana, Urko Agirre, Miren Bermejo, Jesús Pozo, and Arturo Elosegi. 2008.  
602 "Environmental Controls of Whole-Stream Metabolism Identified from Continuous  
603 Monitoring of Basque Streams." *Journal of the North American Benthological Society*  
604 27 (2): 252–68.
- 605 Janisch, Jack E., Steven M. Wondzell, and William J. Ehinger. 2012. "Headwater Stream  
606 Temperature: Interpreting Response after Logging, with and without Riparian  
607 Buffers, Washington, USA." *Forest Ecology and Management* 270 (April): 302–13.  
608 doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2011.12.035.
- 609 Kaushal, S. S., G. E. Likens, N. A. Jaworski, M. L. Pace, A. M. Sides, D. Seekell, K. T. Belt, D. H.  
610 Secor, and R. L. Wingate. 2010. "Rising Stream and River Temperatures in the United  
611 States." *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 8 (9): 461–66.
- 612 Kurylyk, B. L., C. P.-A. Bourque, and K. T. B. MacQuarrie. 2013a. "Potential Surface  
613 Temperature and Shallow Groundwater Temperature Response to Climate Change:  
614 An Example from a Small Forested Catchment in East-Central New Brunswick  
615 (Canada)." *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.* 17 (7): 2701–16. doi:10.5194/hess-17-2701-2013.
- 616 Leach, J. A., and R. D. Moore. 2013. "Winter Stream Temperature in the Rain-on-Snow Zone  
617 of the Pacific Northwest: Influences of Hillslope Runoff and Transient Snow Cover."  
618 *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences Discussions* 10 (10): 12951–3.  
619 doi:10.5194/hessd-10-12951-2013.
- 620 Lewis, T. E., D. R. Lamphear, D. R. McCanne, A. S. Webb, J. P. Krieter, and W. D. Conroy.  
621 2000. *Regional Assessment of Stream Temperatures across Northern California and*  
622 *Their Relationship to Various Landscape-Level and Site-Specific Attributes*. Humboldt  
623 State University Foundation.  
624 [http://www.krisweb.com/biblio/ncc\\_hsu\\_lewisetal\\_2000\\_fspregass.pdf](http://www.krisweb.com/biblio/ncc_hsu_lewisetal_2000_fspregass.pdf).
- 625 Lynsey Long, S., and C. Rhett Jackson. 2013. "Variation of Stream Temperature among  
626 Mesoscale Habitats within Stream Reaches: Southern Appalachians." *Hydrological*  
627 *Processes*, n/a–n/a. doi:10.1002/hyp.9818.
- 628 MacDonald, Ryan J., Sarah Boon, James M. Byrne, and Uldis Silins. 2013a. "A Comparison of  
629 Surface and Subsurface Controls on Summer Temperature in a Headwater Stream."  
630 *Hydrological Processes*, n/a–n/a. doi:10.1002/hyp.9756.
- 631 ———. 2013b. "A Comparison of Surface and Subsurface Controls on Summer Temperature  
632 in a Headwater Stream." *Hydrological Processes*, n/a–n/a. doi:10.1002/hyp.9756.
- 633 Malcolm, I. A., D. M. Hannah, M. J. Donaghy, C. Soulsby, and A. F. Youngson. 2004. "The  
634 influence of riparian woodland on the spatial and temporal variability of stream  
635 water temperatures in an upland salmon stream." *Hydrology and Earth System*  
636 *Sciences Discussions* 8 (3): 449–59.

1  
2  
3 637 Malcolm, I. A., C. Soulsby, D. M. Hannah, P. J. Bacon, A. F. Youngson, and D. Tetzlaff. 2008.  
4 638 "The Influence of Riparian Woodland on Stream Temperatures: Implications for the  
5 639 Performance of Juvenile Salmonids." *Hydrological Processes* 22 (7): 968–79.  
6 640 doi:10.1002/hyp.6996.

8  
9 641 Mayer, Timothy D. 2012. "Controls of Summer Stream Temperature in the Pacific  
10 642 Northwest." *Journal of Hydrology*.  
11 643 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022169412008864>.

13 644 Met Office, FitzRoy Road. 2012. "Summer 2012". Reference. *Met Office*.  
14 645 <http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/climate/uk/summaries/2012/summer>.

16  
17 646 ———. 2013a. "Winter 2012/13". Reference. *Met Office*.  
18 647 <http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/climate/uk/summaries/2013/winter>.

20 648 ———. 2013b. "Spring 2013". Reference. *Met Office*.  
21 649 <http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/climate/uk/summaries/2013/spring>.

23 650 ———. 2013c. "Summer 2013". Reference. *Met Office*.  
24 651 <http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/climate/uk/summaries/2013/summer>.

26 652 Moore, R D. (Dan). 2006. "Stream Temperature Patterns in British Columbia, Canada, Based  
27 653 on Routine Spot Measurements." *Canadian Water Resources Journal / Revue*  
28 654 *Canadienne Des Ressources Hydriques* 31 (1): 41–56. doi:10.4296/cwrj3101041.

30  
31 655 Moore, R.D., M. Nelitz, and E. Parkinson. 2013. "Empirical Modelling of Maximum Weekly  
32 656 Average Stream Temperature in British Columbia, Canada, to Support Assessment of  
33 657 Fish Habitat Suitability." *Canadian Water Resources Journal* 38 (2): 135–47.  
34 658 doi:10.1080/07011784.2013.794992.

36  
37 659 Orr, Harriet G., Gavin L. Simpson, Sophie des Clers, Glenn Watts, Mike Hughes, Jamie  
38 660 Hannaford, Michael J. Dunbar, et al. 2014. "Detecting Changing River Temperatures  
39 661 in England and Wales." *Hydrological Processes*, n/a–n/a. doi:10.1002/hyp.10181.

41 662 Rutherford, J. Christopher, Shane Blackett, Colin Blackett, Laurel Saito, and Robert J. Davies-  
42 663 Colley. 1997. "Predicting the Effects of Shade on Water Temperature in Small  
43 664 Streams." *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 31 (5): 707–21.  
44 665 doi:10.1080/00288330.1997.9516801.

46  
47 666 Sinokrot, B., and H. Stefan. 1994. "Stream Water-Temperature Sensitivity to Weather and  
48 667 Bed Parameters." *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering* 120 (6): 722–36.  
49 668 doi:10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9429(1994)120:6(722).

51  
52 669 Sinokrot, B.A., and H.G. Stefan. 1993. "Stream Temperature Dynamics: Measurements and  
53 670 Modeling." *Water Resources Research* 29 (7): 2299–2312.

54  
55 671 Sinokrot, Bashar A., and John S. Gulliver. 2000. "In-Stream Flow Impact on River Water  
56 672 Temperatures." *Journal of Hydraulic Research* 38 (5): 339–49.  
57 673 doi:10.1080/00221680009498315.

58  
59  
60

- 674 Sowder, Colin, and E. Ashley Steel. 2012. "A Note on the Collection and Cleaning of Water  
675 Temperature Data." *Water* 4 (4): 597–606. doi:10.3390/w4030597.
- 676 "Temperature Loggers and Outdoor Data Loggers for Environmental Monitoring." 2013.  
677 *Geminidataloggers.com*. Accessed December 17.  
678 <http://www.geminidataloggers.com/data-loggers/tinytag-plus-2/tgp-4017>.
- 679 Tetzlaff, D., C. Birkel, J. Dick, J. Geris, and C. Soulsby. 2014. "Storage Dynamics in  
680 Hydropedological Units Control Hillslope Connectivity, Runoff Generation and the  
681 Evolution of Catchment Transit Time Distributions." *Water Resources Research*, n/a–  
682 n/a. doi:10.1002/2013WR014147.
- 683 Tetzlaff, D., C. Soulsby, S. Waldron, IA Malcolm, PJ Bacon, SM Dunn, A. Lilly, and AF  
684 Youngson. 2007. "Conceptualization of Runoff Processes Using a Geographical  
685 Information System and Tracers in a Nested Mesoscale Catchment." *Hydrological  
686 Processes* 21 (10): 1289–1307.
- 687 UKCP09. 2009. "UK Climate Projections."
- 688 Webb, B. W., and D. E. Walling. 1985. "Temporal Variation of River Water Temperatures in a  
689 Devon River System." *Hydrological Sciences Journal* 30 (4): 449–64.  
690 doi:10.1080/02626668509491011.
- 691 Wilkerson, Ethel, John M. Hagan, Darlene Siegel, and Andrew A. Whitman. 2006. "The  
692 Effectiveness of Different Buffer Widths for Protecting Headwater Stream  
693 Temperature in Maine." *Forest Science* 52 (3): 221–31.
- 694

Catchment	Area (km2)	% wetland soils	Mean Slope (°)	Aspect (°)	Mean elevation (m)	W:D ratio at point of sample
HW1	0.65	17.2	15	146 (NW)	339	1.50
HW2	0.43	8.4	15	103 (E)	397	2.00
HW3	0.81	22	14	122 (NW)	409	0.75
SW4	2.03	10.3	14	126 (NW)	379	1.00
SW5	2.04	17.9	14	126 (NW)	378	1.75
SW6	2.29	18.2	13	138 (NW)	371	3.00
SW7	2.39	18.3	13	141 (NW)	368	1.00
SW8	2.44	18.6	13	143 (NW)	367	1.17
SW9	2.54	19.1	13	145 (NW)	364	1.17
SW10	2.82	20.8	13	150 (NW)	358	0.88
SW11	3.16	21.5	13	151 (NW)	352	3.50
Bruntland Burn	3.29	21.5	13	151 (NW)	349	1.30

Table 1: Characteristics of the catchment areas above each of the stream water temperature loggers, including the three headwaters (HW1-HW3).




	Mean (°C)	Minimum (°C)	Maximum (°C)	Max-Min Difference (°C)	Std. Deviation (°C)	Degree Days
HW1	6.55	-0.03	21.07	21.1	5.45	2392
HW2	6.45	0.06	23.70	23.64	5.33	2355
HW3	6.31	0.04	17.53	17.49	4.71	2303
SW4	6.41	0.06	18.19	18.13	4.90	2340
SW5	6.41	0.03	18.30	18.27	4.92	2341
SW6	6.44	0.07	18.24	18.17	4.89	2350
SW7	6.40	0.05	18.15	18.1	4.85	2338
SW8	6.42	0.06	18.09	18.03	4.81	2343
SW9	6.41	0.04	17.99	17.95	4.75	2340
SW10	6.02	-0.55	17.73	18.28	4.90	2198
SW11	6.32	-0.31	18.23	18.54	4.87	2305
Deep groundwater (GW1)	6.98	5.49	8.67	3.18	1.02	2666
Shallow groundwater (GW2)	5.50	1.36	13.32	11.97	3.39	2207
Shallow groundwater (GW3)	5.82	1.81	12.96	11.15	3.25	2308
Shallow groundwater (GW4)	6.69	3.29	11.02	7.73	2.31	2440
Surface water (SFW1)	6.31	0.28	19.53	19.25	4.90	2301
Surface water (SFW2)	6.44	-0.89	19.53	20.42	5.14	2352
Surface water (SFW3)	6.17	0.15	17.43	17.28	5.05	2132
Surface water (SFW4)	6.43	-9.11	23.78	32.89	5.69	2362
Air temperature	5.74	-13.59	22.11	35.7	6.00	1865

Table 2: Descriptive statistics for all stream water (HW1-3 and SW4-11), groundwater (GW1-4) during the period July 2012 to July 2013 (based on hourly data). The period was chosen to avoid biasing the data by including two summer periods.


		HW1	HW2	HW3	SW4	SW5	SW6	SW7	SW8	SW9	SW10	SW11	AT
Summer 2012	Mean	12.90	12.55	12.05	12.29	12.31	12.33	12.27	12.23	12.16	11.88	12.14	11.77
	Minimum	5.53	5.66	7.10	6.74	6.70	6.76	6.81	6.73	6.59	5.79	5.65	-3.31
	Maximum	21.47	21.49	17.53	18.35	18.61	18.62	18.54	18.41	18.14	17.73	18.11	22.11
	Std. Deviation	2.62	2.51	1.71	1.93	1.95	1.94	1.92	1.91	1.91	2.04	1.99	3.70
Autumn 2012	Mean	3.76	3.89	4.34	4.19	4.17	4.21	4.19	4.23	4.25	3.75	4.08	3.62
	Minimum	-0.02	0.10	0.08	0.09	0.06	0.09	0.07	0.08	0.07	-0.55	-0.26	-12.10
	Maximum	11.67	12.03	9.91	10.29	10.25	10.25	10.11	10.13	10.19	10.24	10.59	15.05
	Std. Deviation	2.84	2.77	2.47	2.57	2.58	2.57	2.56	2.54	2.51	2.55	2.57	4.42
Winter 2012/13	Mean	1.30	1.33	1.51	1.49	1.48	1.53	1.53	1.59	1.65	1.14	1.46	1.24
	Minimum	-0.03	0.06	0.04	0.06	0.03	0.07	0.05	0.06	0.04	-0.55	-0.31	-13.60
	Maximum	5.96	5.67	5.37	5.52	5.53	5.57	5.56	5.59	5.64	5.41	5.58	11.82
	Std. Deviation	1.37	1.27	1.24	1.27	1.28	1.27	1.27	1.27	1.27	1.33	1.33	3.85
Spring 2013	Mean	8.00	7.76	7.13	7.44	7.47	7.47	7.43	7.44	7.39	7.10	7.36	6.09
	Minimum	-0.03	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.04	0.07	0.05	0.07	0.04	-0.55	-0.30	-12.72
	Maximum	20.80	23.70	15.97	17.30	17.58	17.04	16.54	16.67	16.95	17.73	18.23	19.39
	Std. Deviation	4.91	5.01	4.15	4.37	4.38	4.34	4.27	4.22	4.17	4.34	4.29	5.78
Summer 2013	Mean	13.82	13.78	12.53	12.91	12.88	11.57	12.57	12.58	12.58	13.60	13.13	13.06
	Minimum	6.15	5.36	7.64	7.38	7.21	7.09	6.67	5.72	5.75	8.04	5.23	0.26
	Maximum	23.19	25.97	17.87	19.21	19.41	19.30	19.19	19.56	19.43	20.91	21.67	26.93
	Std. Deviation	2.79	3.55	1.73	1.98	2.00	2.49	2.00	2.30	2.32	2.42	2.75	4.53

Table 3: Descriptive statistics for stream water loggers (HW1-3 and SW4-11) and air temperature (AT) during 5 different seasons (°C, based on hourly data). Seasons defined astronomically.







Aerial map of Bruntland Burn valley bottom showing locations of temperature loggers and logger IDs. (HW: Headwater streams; SW: Stream water; GW: Groundwater; SFW: Surface water). The precipitation and discharge was measured in the same location as SW11. Map inserts show: a) location of study site within Scotland, b) the location of the headwaters, and c) the soil cover.  
244x141mm (150 x 150 DPI)



a) Mean daily incoming radiation b) Mean daily air temperature, c) precipitation d) discharge and e) daily saturation extent (calculated as percentage of total catchment area) for study period (1st July 12 – 30th June 13) Spring and autumn are shaded in grey. Data from automatic weather station located in the Girnock Burn catchment.  
187x148mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Hourly temperature box plots for each water temperature logger for the period July 2012 to July 2013. The plot shows: 5th and 95th percentiles (dots); 10th and 90th percentiles (whiskers); 25th and 75th percentiles (box); median (centre line)  
281x119mm (150 x 150 DPI)




Water temperatures for 1st July 12 – 1st July 13. a) Logger SFW4 as an example for an atmospheric driven site; b) GW1 deeper groundwater; c) GW4 Shallow groundwater within riparian zone peats. Loggers were selected to provide examples of deep groundwater with little seasonality, shallow groundwater with more seasonality and greater influence from atmospheric drivers, and the purely atmospherically driven surface water.


118x87mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Selected stream water loggers: HW1, HW2, HW3, SW5, SW9 and SW11 clockwise (based on weekly data).  
Showing Min (blue), max (red) and mean weekly water temperatures (black) for period 1st July 2012 to  
30th June 2013  
177x98mm (300 x 300 DPI)



Stream water temperature exceedance curves (based on hourly data) for a) Winter; b) Spring; c) Summer; d) Autumn. Seasons are delineated using astronomical definitions, with each season separated by the two equinoxes and solstices of March 20th, June 21st, September 22nd, December 21st.  
276x141mm (150 x 150 DPI)




Water temperatures for a 24 hr, cold / wet period (1st February 2013); a) precipitation b) Stream water temperatures for each headwater catchment (HW1, HW2, HW3) and the outlet (SW11) and c) Surface water temperatures in riparian zone (SFW1, SFW2 and SFW3) (shown as hourly data).  
250x329mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Water temperatures for a 24 hr, cold/dry period (9th November 2012) a) Stream water temperatures for each headwater catchment (HW1, HW2, HW3) and the outlet (SW11) and b) Surface water temperatures in riparian zone (SFW1, SFW2 and SFW3) (shown as hourly data).  
217x264mm (300 x 300 DPI)





Water temperatures for a 24 hr, warm / wet period (27th August 2012): a) precipitation b) Stream water temperatures for each headwater catchment (HW1, HW2, HW3) and the outlet (SW11) and c) Surface water temperatures in riparian zone (SFW3, SFW4, GW1 and air temperature) (shown as hourly data).  
255x346mm (300 x 300 DPI)



Water temperatures for a 24 hr, warm / dry period (8th September 2012) a) Stream water temperatures for each headwater catchment (HW1, HW2, HW3) and the outlet (SW11) and b) Surface water temperatures in riparian zone (SFW3, SFW4, GW1 and air temperature) (shown as hourly data).  
221x261mm (300 x 300 DPI)